arXiv:1612.02661v2 [hep-ph] 16 Jan 2017

Dark Matter, Leptogenesis, and Neutrino Mass from the Minimal Extension of the SM with $U(1)_{B-L} \otimes Z_2$

Wei-Min Yang

Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, P. R. China
E-mail: wmyang@ustc.edu.cn

Abstract: I suggest a minimal extension of the SM with $U(1)_{B-L} \otimes Z_2$. The model can simultaneously accommodate the tiny neutrino mass, cold dark mater and matter-antimatter symmetry besides the SM. In particular, it can naturally explain the "WIMP Miracle" and elegantly achieve the leptogenesis just above the electroweak scale. These new physics all arise from the TeV-scale violation of $U(1)_{B-L}$, therefore it is possible and promising to test the model in near future experiments.

Keywords: new model beyond SM; dark matter; leptogenesis; neutrino mass

PACS: 12.60.-i; 95.30.Cq; 14.60.Pq

I. Introduction

The standard model (SM) of the particle physics has successfully accounted for all kinds of the physics at or below the electroweak scale [1], but it can not explain some important issues such as the tiny neutrino mass [2], the cold dark matter (CDM) [3] and the baryon asymmetry [4]. Some inspired theoretical ideas have been suggested to solve these problems, for instance, the tiny neutrino mass can be generated by the seesaw mechanism [5], the baryon asymmetry can be achieved by the thermal leptogenesis or the electroweak baryogenesis [6, 7], the CDM candidates are possibly the sterile neutrino [8], the lightest supersymmetric particle [9], the axion [10], and so on. Although many progresses on these fields have been made all the time [11], a convincing and unified theory is not established as yet.

Based on the universe harmony and the nature unification, it is hard to believe that the tiny neutrino mass, the CDM and the matter-antimatter asymmetry appear to be not related to each other. A realistic theory beyond the SM should simultaneously account for the three things, moreover, it should keep such principles as the simplicity and the fewer number of parameters. In addition, the new theory is feasible and promising to be tested in future experiments. If one theory is excessive complexity and unable to be tested, it is unbelievable and infeasible. I suggest a feasible and minimal extension of the SM. It only adds the $U(1)_{B-L}\otimes Z_2$ symmetry and a few particles to the SM but it is able to accommodate the above three things, in addition, we can probe these attractive new physics at the TeV-scale colliders.

II. Model

The model has the local gauge groups of $G_{SM}\otimes U(1)_{B-L}$ and the hidden symmetry of Z_2, where B and L respectively denote the baryon and lepton numbers. The particle contents and their gauge quantum numbers under $SU(2)_L\otimes U(1)_Y\otimes U(1)_{B-L}$ are listed as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} &l_L(2,-1,-1)_1, \quad e_R^-(1,-2,-1)_1, \quad N_R^0(1,0,-1)_{-1}, \\ &H(2,1,0)_1, \quad \Delta(3,-2,-2)_1, \quad \phi^0(1,0,-2)_1, \quad \phi^-(1,-2,-2)_{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the right subscripts of the brackets are the parities under Z_2, namely $N_R\to -N_R$, $\phi^-\to -\phi^-$, and the rest of the fields are unchanged. N_R will become the Majorana fermion and the CDM due to the Z_2 symmetry. The model is obviously anomaly-free. Here I ignore the quark sector and the color subgroup $SU(3)_C$ because what followed have nothing to do with them.

The gauge kinetic energy terms are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}_G &= \mathscr{L}_{pure\,gauge} + \sum_f i\,\overline{f}\,\gamma^\mu D_\mu f + \sum_S (D^\mu S)^\dagger D_\mu S\,, \\ D_\mu &= \partial_\mu + i\left(g_2 W_\mu^i \frac{\tau^i}{2} + g_1 B_\mu \frac{Y}{2} + g_0 X_\mu \frac{B-L}{2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where f and S respectively denote all kinds of the fermions and scalars in (1), and these notations in D_μ are self-explanatory. The Yukawa couplings are

$$\mathscr{L}_Y = \overline{l_L} Y_E e_R H + \frac{1}{2} l_L^T C Y_\nu \Delta^\dagger l_L + \frac{1}{2} N_R^T C Y_N N_R \phi^{0*} + N_R^T C Y_D e_R \phi^+ + h.c.\,, \tag{3}$$

where C is the charge conjugation matrix. Note that the Z_2 symmetry forbids the two couplings of $\overline{l_L} Y N_R i\tau_2 H^*$ and $l_L^T C Y i\tau_2 l_L \phi^+$, this can ensure the stability of N_R. $Y_{E,\nu,N,D}$ are all complex matrices, some phases in them can not be removed by the flavour basis choice and the redefined field phases, so the lepton sector contains new CP-violating sources besides the old one in the quark sector. The last term in (3) plays a key role in the CDM and the leptogenesis.

The scalar potentials are

$$\begin{aligned} V_S =& \frac{1}{4\lambda_\Delta}\left(2\lambda_\Delta Tr[\Delta^\dagger\Delta] - (\lambda_\Delta v_\Delta^2 + \lambda_1 v_H^2 + \lambda_2 v_\phi^2) + (\frac{M_\Delta v_\Delta}{v_\Delta})^2\right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{4\lambda_H}\left(2\lambda_H H^\dagger H - (\lambda_1 v_\Delta^2 + \lambda_H v_H^2 + \lambda_3 v_\phi^2) + (\frac{M_\Delta v_\Delta}{v_H})^2\right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{4\lambda_{\phi^0}}\left(2\lambda_{\phi^0}\phi^{0*}\phi^0 - (\lambda_2 v_\Delta^2 + \lambda_3 v_H^2 + \lambda_\phi v_\phi^2) + (\frac{M_\Delta v_\Delta}{v_\phi})^2\right)^2 \\ &+ \lambda_{\phi^-}\left(\phi^+\phi^-\right)^2 + 2\lambda_1 Tr[\Delta^\dagger\Delta]H^\dagger H + 2\left(\lambda_2 Tr[\Delta^\dagger\Delta] + \lambda_3 H^\dagger H\right)\phi^{0*}\phi^0 \\ &+ 2\left(\lambda_4 Tr[\Delta^\dagger\Delta] + \lambda_5 H^\dagger H + \lambda_6\phi^{0*}\phi^0\right)\phi^+\phi^- \\ &+ 2\left(\lambda_7 Tr[H^T i\tau_2\Delta i\tau_2 H]\phi^{0*} + \lambda_8 Tr[\Delta i\tau_2\Delta i\tau_2]\phi^+\phi^+ + h.c.\right), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $v_\Delta = \frac{\lambda_7 v_\phi v_H^2}{M_\Delta^2}$ and M_Δ is the original super-heavy mass of Δ. $i\tau_2$ is inserted in order to satisfy the $SU(2)_L$ symmetry. The three independent mass-dimensional parameters are $[M_\Delta, v_H, v_\phi] > 0$. The coupling parameters satisfy such conditions as $[\lambda_\Delta, \lambda_H, \lambda_{\phi^0}, \lambda_{\phi^-}, \lambda_6, \lambda_7] \sim 0.1 > 0$ and the others are sufficiently small. These conditions can ensure the vacuum stability. The vacuum configurations derived from the V_{Scalar} minimum are

$$\langle\Delta\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{v_\Delta}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle H\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{v_H}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle\phi^0\rangle = \frac{v_\phi}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \langle\phi^-\rangle = 0\,. \tag{5}$$

The vacuum expectation values have such hierarchy as $v_\Delta \sim 0.1\,\text{eV} \ll v_H \approx 246\,\text{GeV} < v_\phi \sim 10\,\text{TeV}$. v_H has been fixed by the electroweak physics, while v_Δ and v_ϕ can respectively be determined by the tiny neutrino mass and the baryon asymmetry.

$\langle\phi^0\rangle$ and $\langle H\rangle$ result in the spontaneous breakings of $U(1)_{B-L}$ and $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ in sequence. $\langle\Delta\rangle$ simultaneously breaks the both symmetries, but v_Δ is so small that it has actually no impacts on the two breakings. However, the Z_2 symmetry is always kept.



Figure. 1. (a) The radiative decay of the heavier $N_{2,3}$ into the CDM N_1. (b) The associated annihilation of N_1 and ϕ^- naturally leads to the "WIMP Miracle".

After gauge symmetry breakings the particles obtain their masses as follows,

$$M_\Delta = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_7 v_\phi v_H^2}{v_\Delta}}\,, \quad M_H = v_H\sqrt{2\lambda_H(1-\frac{\lambda_3^2}{\lambda_H\lambda_{\phi^0}})}\,, \quad M_{\phi^0} \approx v_\phi\sqrt{2\lambda_{\phi^0}}\,, \quad M_{\phi^-} \approx v_\phi\sqrt{\lambda_6}\,,$$
$$M_e = -\frac{v_H}{\sqrt{2}}Y_E\,, \quad M_\nu = -\frac{v_\Delta}{\sqrt{2}}Y_\nu\,, \quad M_N = -\frac{v_\phi}{\sqrt{2}}Y_N\,, \quad M_{X_\mu} = v_\phi g_0, \tag{6}$$

Note that ϕ^0 and H^0 has a small mixing of $\sim \frac{\lambda_3 v_H}{\lambda_{\phi^0} v_\phi}$, but the mixing between X_μ and Z_μ is nearly zero. $M_{\phi^0}, M_{\phi^-}, M_N, M_{X_\mu}$ are all proportional to $v_\phi \sim 10$ TeV, so they are several TeVs or so. For $M_\Delta \sim 10^9$ GeV, then $v_\Delta \sim 0.1$ eV, thus the tiny neutrino mass is generated by the type-II seesaw. Finally, the neutrino masses and mixing can be fitted by choosing suitable texture of Y_ν under the mass eigenstate basis of the charged leptons.

III. Dark Matter

For the three mass eigenstates of N_R, we can assume such mass spectrum as $M_{N_1} \sim 0.1 < M_{N_2} < M_{N_3} \sim 1 < M_{\phi^-} \sim 10$ (TeV as unit) without loss of generality since this is very reasonable and believable. In the light of the model couplings, the mass relations and the kinetic restrictions lead that the heavier $N_{2,3}$ can only decay into the lightest N_1 and a photon via the radiative decay shown as (a) in Figure 1, while N_1 can not decay and becomes a stable particle. In fact, N_1 is a real WIMP in the model. Its natures are very well consistent with the CDM ones, so it is a desirable candidate of the CDM.

The current relic abundance of N_1 can be calculated by the thermal production in the early universe. After some careful analysis, the largest annihilation rate of N_1 does not derives from its pair annihilation but rather the associated annihilation $N_1 + \phi^- \to e_i^- + Z_\mu^0$, shown as (b) in Figure 1. The last decoupling and freeze-out of N_1 are actually dominated

by this associated annihilation process. Its annihilation rate is calculated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{N_1+\phi^-} &= \langle\sigma_{N_1+\phi^-}(v_{N_1}n_{N_1}+v_{\phi^-}n_{\phi^-})\rangle \\ &= \langle\sigma_{N_1+\phi^-}v_{N_1}n_{N_1}\left(1+(\frac{M_{\phi^-}}{M_{N_1}})^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{M_{\phi^-}-M_{N_1}}{T}}\right)\rangle \approx \langle\sigma_{N_1+\phi^-}v_{N_1}\rangle n_{N_1}, \\ \sigma_{N_1+\phi^-}v_{N_1} &= \frac{\alpha_e\, tan^2\theta_W(Y_DY_D^\dagger)_{11}}{16\,M_Z^2}, \quad n_{N_1}=2\left(\frac{M_{N_1}T}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}e^{-\frac{M_{N_1}}{T}}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\alpha_e \approx \frac{1}{129}$, $M_Z \approx 91.2$ GeV, and $tan\theta_W \approx 0.55$ is the weak-mixing angle. v_{N_1} and v_{ϕ^-} are velocities of two annihilating particles in the center-of-mass frame, while n_{N_1} and n_{ϕ^-} are their number densities. ϕ^- and N_1 have become non-relativistic particles when N_1 is decoupling. Because M_{ϕ^-} is nearly one hundred times larger than M_{N_1}, the annihilation process in the center-of-mass frame is apparently that a high-velocity N_1 impacts a almost stationary ϕ^-. The annihilation cross-section in (7) does not depend on all of M_{ϕ^-}, M_{N_1} and v_{N_1} but is related to M_Z, obviously, it is naturally a weak interaction cross-section. This is a surprising result, it excellently account for the so-called "WIMP Miracle" [12].

The freeze-out temperature and relic abundance of N_1 are determined by the system of equations,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{N_1+\phi^-}(T_f) = H(T_f) &= \frac{1.66\sqrt{g_*(T_f)}\,T_f^2}{M_{Pl}}\,, \\ \Omega_{N_1}h^2 &= \frac{0.85\times10^{-10}\ \mathrm{GeV}^{-2}}{\sqrt{g_*(T_f)}\,x\,\langle\sigma_{N_1+\phi^-}v_{N_1}\rangle_{T_f}} \approx 0.12\,, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $x=\frac{T_f}{M_{N_1}}$ and $M_{Pl}=1.22\times10^{19}$ GeV. $H(T)$ is the Hubble expansion rate of the universe. g_* is the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom. 0.12 is the current abundance of the CDM [13]. The solutions of (8) are easily given by

$$x \approx \left(20.3+ln\frac{M_{N_1}}{g_*(T_f)\,x^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right)^{-1} \approx \frac{1}{25.5}\,, \quad \langle\sigma_{N_1+\phi^-}v_{N_1}\rangle_{T_f} \approx 2.3\times10^{-9}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-2}. \tag{9}$$

Provided $M_{N_1}\sim 100$ GeV, then $x\approx\frac{1}{25.5}$, thus $T_f\sim 3.9$ GeV, at this temperature the relativistic particles include $photon, gluon, \nu, e, \mu, u, d, s$, so we figure out $g_*(T_f)=61.75$ in (9). The thermal average of the annihilation cross-section is equal to itself in view of (7). Now we only need to choose $(Y_DY_D^\dagger)_{11}\approx 0.13$, we can naturally obtain $\langle\sigma_{N_1+\phi^-}v_{N_1}\rangle_{T_f}\approx 2.3\times10^{-9}$ GeV^{-2}, and then reproduce $\Omega_{N_1}h^2\approx 0.12$. Thus we have simply and perfectly explained the "WIMP Miracle".

IV. Leptogenesis

The model can also account for the baryon asymmetry through the leptogenesis just above the electroweak scale. The two annihilation processes $\phi^\mp+\phi^\mp\to e_\alpha^\mp+e_\beta^\mp$ via the



Figure. 2. Two charged scalars annihilating into two charged leptons via the t-channel mediation of N_i, which eventually leads to the matter-antimatter asymmetry.

t-channel mediation of N_i frequently occur at the TeV-scale temperature, the tree and loop diagrams for the negative process are shown as Figure 2. The processes explicitly violate "2" unit of the $B-L$ number by virtue of the Majorana nature of N_i. For the negative and positive processes, their annihilation rates are CP-asymmetric due to the interference between the tree diagram and the loop one. These are expressed by the following relations,

$$\Gamma^{\mp} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \Gamma(\phi^{\mp} + \phi^{\mp} \to e^{\mp}_{\alpha} + e^{\mp}_{\beta}) = \langle(\sigma_{tree} + \sigma^{\mp}_{loop})v\rangle n^{eq}_{\phi^{\mp}} = (1 \mp \varepsilon)\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle n^{eq}_{\phi^{\mp}}\,,$$

$$n^{eq}_{\phi^{\mp}} = (\frac{T}{\sqrt{2\pi x}})^3 e^{-\frac{1}{x}}, \quad \langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle = \frac{(1-\frac{\langle v^2\rangle}{2})}{2\pi M^4_{\phi^-}} \sum_{i,j} (Y_D Y_D^{\dagger})^2_{ij} M_{N_i} M_{N_j},$$

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\langle(\sigma^+_{loop} - \sigma^-_{loop})v\rangle}{2\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle} = \frac{\sum\limits_{i,j,k} Im[(Y_D Y_D^{\dagger})_{ik}(Y_D Y_D^{\dagger})_{jk}(Y_D Y_D^{\dagger})_{ji}] M_{N_j} M_{N_k} \langle \int \frac{Im[tC_{11}]\,dt}{(t-M^2_{N_i})(t-M^2_{N_j})sv}\rangle}{8\pi^2 \sum\limits_{i,j} (Y_D Y_D^{\dagger})^2_{ji} M_{N_i} M_{N_j} \langle \int \frac{dt}{(t-M^2_{N_i})(t-M^2_{N_j})sv}\rangle}\,,$$

$$Im[tC_{11}] = \frac{(i\pi)t}{a-t}[1 + \frac{2a-t}{a-t} ln \frac{2a^2 - at}{a^2 - \beta t}], \tag{10}$$

where $x = \frac{T}{M_{\phi^-}}, a = M^2_{\phi^-}, \beta = M^2_{N_k}$. s and t is the Mandelstam variables. $v = 2(1 - \frac{4M^2_{\phi^-}}{s})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a relative velocity of two annihilating particles and $\langle v^2\rangle = 6x$. $n^{eq}_{\phi^{\mp}}$ is the number density of $\phi^{\mp}$ in the thermal equilibrium. $C_{11}(M^2_{\phi^-}, m^2_e, t, m^2_e, M^2_{N_k}, M^2_{\phi^-})$ is a three-point function from the loop integration, its imaginary part is non-zero when $M_{\phi^-} > M_{N_k}$. A simply calculation shows $Im[tC_{11}] \sim \mathcal{O}(i\pi)$. The CP asymmetry ε is surely non-vanishing on account of the CP-violating sources in Y_D. Provided $(Y_D Y_D^{\dagger})_{ij} \sim 0.1$, $M_{N_3} \sim 1$ TeV and $M_{\phi^-} \sim 10$ TeV, then we can roughly estimate $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle \sim 10^{-14}$ GeV^{-2} and $\varepsilon \sim 0.01$, which should be their typical values.

As the universe temperature decreasing, $\phi^{\mp}$ become non-relativistic particles, further-

more, the annihilation rates will become smaller than the universe expansion rate, thus the annihilation processes will gradually be out-of-equilibrium. The freeze-out temperature is solved by the relation,

$$\Gamma^{\mp}(T_f) = H(T_f) = \frac{1.66\sqrt{g_*(T_f)}\,T_f^2}{M_{Pl}}\,,$$
$$\Longrightarrow x_f = \frac{T_f}{M_{\phi^-}} \approx \left(17.6 + ln\frac{M_{\phi^-}}{\sqrt{g_*(T_f)x_f}} + ln\frac{\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle}{10^{-10}\ \mathrm{GeV}^{-2}}\right)^{-1}. \tag{11}$$

Provided $M_{\phi^-} \sim 10$ TeV and $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle \sim 10^{-14}\ \mathrm{GeV}^{-2}$, then we obtain $x_f \sim \frac{1}{16.5}$, thus $T_f \sim 606$ GeV. This freeze-out temperature is below the TeV scale but above the electroweak scale. The relativistic particles are exactly all of the SM ones, so $g_*(T_f) = 106.75$ in (11).

We have demonstrated that Sakharov's three conditions are completely satisfied in the model [14]. Below the freeze-out temperature, the two annihilation processes will quickly deviate from the thermal equilibrium in their separate ways due to their CP-asymmetric annihilation rates. As a result, the negative and positive charged leptons produced by the two processes have CP-asymmetric number densities, and then the two asymmetric number densities will gradually become invariant in the comoving volume, thus a stable $B-L$ asymmetry is eventually generated. These results are obtained by solving the following Boltzmann system of equations [15],

$$Y_{e^\mp} = \frac{n_{e^\mp}}{s}\,,\quad Y_{e^-}^{eq} = Y_{e^+}^{eq} = \frac{n_{e^\mp}^{eq}}{s}\,,\quad Y_{e^\mp}(x_f) = Y_{e^\mp}^{eq}(x_f),$$
$$Y_{\phi^\mp} = \frac{n_{\phi^\mp}}{s}\,,\quad Y_{\phi^-}^{eq} = Y_{\phi^+}^{eq} = \frac{n_{\phi^\mp}^{eq}}{s}\,,\quad Y_{\phi^\mp}(x_f) = Y_{\phi^\mp}^{eq}(x_f),$$
$$\frac{dY_{e^-}}{d\,x} = -\frac{dY_{\phi^-}}{d\,x} = -\frac{\Gamma^-(T)}{xH(T)}\,\frac{Y_{\phi^-}^2 - Y_{\phi^-}^{eq2}}{Y_{\phi^-}^{eq}}\,,\quad \frac{dY_{e^+}}{d\,x} = -\frac{dY_{\phi^+}}{d\,x} = -\frac{\Gamma^+(T)}{xH(T)}\,\frac{Y_{\phi^+}^2 - Y_{\phi^+}^{eq2}}{Y_{\phi^+}^{eq}}\,,$$
$$Y_{e^-}(x) - Y_{e^-}(x_f) = -(Y_{\phi^-}(x) - Y_{\phi^-}(x_f)),\quad Y_{e^+}(x) - Y_{e^+}(x_f) = -(Y_{\phi^+}(x) - Y_{\phi^+}(x_f)),$$
$$Y_{B-L} = (-2)(Y_{\phi^-}(x) - Y_{\phi^+}(x)) + (-1)(Y_{e^-}(x) - Y_{e^+}(x)) = -(Y_{\phi^-}(x) - Y_{\phi^+}(x)), \tag{12}$$

where $s = \frac{2\pi^2}{45}g_*(T)T^3$ is the entropy density. We can numerically solve $Y_{\phi^-}(x)$ and $Y_{\phi^+}(x)$, respectively, then Y_{B-L} is given by their difference.

The above $B-L$ asymmetry is generated in the temperature areas between $T_f \sim 606$ GeV and the electroweak scale of ~ 100 GeV, therefore the electroweak sphaleron process is efficiently put into effect [16], it can convert a part of the $B-L$ asymmetry into the baryon asymmetry. This is expressed by the relation

$$\eta_B = \frac{n_B - \overline{n}_B}{n_\gamma} = 7.04\,c_s Y_{B-L} \approx 6.1\times 10^{-10}, \tag{13}$$

where $c_s = \frac{32}{89}$ is a coefficient of the sphaleron conversion in the model. 7.04 is a ratio of the entropy density to the photon number density. 6.1×10^{-10} is the current value of the baryon asymmetry [17]. Note that $\phi^\mp$ participate in the sphaleron process besides the



Figure. 3. The variations of Y_{ϕ^-} and Y_{ϕ^+} with x for these two sets of values of $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle$ and ε which can fit η_B, while $M_{\phi^-} = 10$ TeV. Note $Y_{\phi^-} - Y_{\phi^+} = -Y_{B-L}$.

SM particles, but ϕ^0 and N_i are not involved in it since they are the electroweak singlets. When the universe temperature falls below the electroweak scale, the sphaleron process is closed and the baryon asymmetry is kept up to the present day.

V. Numerical Results and Discussions

All of the SM parameters have been fixed by the experimental data [18]. Some key and fundamental parameters of the model are chosen such typical values as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} &M_\Delta = 10^9\,\text{GeV}, \quad v_\phi = 20\,\text{TeV}, \quad v_H = 246\,\text{GeV}, \quad v_\Delta = 0.1\,\text{eV}, \\ &M_{\phi^-} = 10\,\text{TeV}, \quad M_{N_3} = 1\,\text{TeV}, \quad M_{N_1} = 100\,\text{GeV}, \\ &(Y_\nu)_{33} = 0.5, \quad (Y_D Y_D^\dagger)_{11} = 0.13\,, \quad \langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle = 10^{-14}\,\text{GeV}^{-2}, \quad \varepsilon = -0.08\,. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In (10), $(Y_D Y_D^\dagger)_{ij} \sim 0.1$ is in charge of ε, while M_{ϕ^-} and M_{N_3} jointly dominate $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle$. M_{ϕ^-} is determined by the consistent temperature of the leptogenesis. Since the annihilation rates essentially depend on $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle$ and ε, we can directly take $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle$ and ε as the input parameters to fit η_B instead of M_{N_3} and $(Y_D Y_D^\dagger)_{ij}$. Now put (14) into the foregoing equations, we can completely reproduce the desired results,

$$m_{\nu_3} \approx 0.035\,\text{eV}, \quad \Omega_{N_1}h^2 \approx 0.12\,, \quad \eta_B \approx 6.1 \times 10^{-10}. \tag{15}$$

These are exactly the current experimental data [18].

Figure 3 shows that both Y_{ϕ^-} and Y_{ϕ^+} vary with x for these two cases of $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle = 1 \times 10^{-14}$ GeV^{-2}, $\varepsilon = -0.08$ and $\langle\sigma_{tree}v\rangle = 0.5 \times 10^{-14}$ GeV^{-2}, $\varepsilon = -0.051$, the both can

correctly fit η_B. The right green curve is the evolution of $Y^{eq}_{\phi^\mp}$ in the thermal equilibrium. The intersection of $Y_{\phi^\mp}$ and $Y^{eq}_{\phi^\mp}$ indicates that the freeze-out temperature is $x_f \sim \frac{1}{16.5}$, namely $T_f \sim 606$ GeV. It is clearly seen from the graph that Y_{ϕ^-} and Y_{ϕ^+} are gradually separated from each other after they are departure from the thermal equilibrium, and then they will gradually tend to two invariant values. The difference between Y_{ϕ^-} and Y_{ϕ^+} is namely equal to $-Y_{B-L}$. When the temperature reduces to $x \sim 0.01$, namely the electroweak scale of $T \sim 100$ GeV, the size of Y_{B-L} reaches $\sim \eta_B$. In the meantime, Y_{B-L} is partly converted into the baryon asymmetry through the electroweak sphaleron process before it is closed.

Finally, the model can be tested at the colliders. The new particles can be probed by the following processes,

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^- + e^+ \, or \, p + \overline{p} \to X_\mu \to N_i + \overline{N_i}, \quad e^- + e^+ \, or \, p + \overline{p} \to \gamma \to \phi^- + \phi^+, \\
&p + p \to \gamma + \gamma \to \phi^- + \phi^+, \quad p + p \to X_\mu + X_\mu \to \phi^0, \\
&\phi^\mp \to e_i^\mp + N_j, \quad N_{2,3} \to N_1 + \gamma, \quad \phi^0 \to N_i + N_i \, or \, H + H.
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

$e^- + e^+$ or $p + \overline{p}$ can produce a pair of N_i via the s-channel mediation of X_μ, they can also produce a pair of $\phi^\mp$ via the gamma photon mediation if the center-of-mass energy is enough high. The future colliders such as CEPC and ILC have some potentials to achieve these goals [19]. If the LHC should improve its energy [20], we have a chance to find $\phi^\mp$ via two gamma photon fusion, and then we can detect the CDM N_1 by the decay chain of $\phi^\mp$. In addition, we even possible generate some asymmetric leptons in the laboratory to test the leptogenesis mechanism just above the electroweak scale. Of course, it will be very large challenges to actualize these experiments, but the model tests very possible come true in the near future.

VI. Conclusions

In summary, we only need to make the minimal extension of the SM, then we can simultaneously account for the tiny neutrino mass, the CDM and the matter-antimatter asymmetry. In particular, the model can perfectly explain the "WIMP Miracle" and elegantly achieve the leptogenesis just above the electroweak scale. However, these TeV-scale new physics are very attractive and worth researching in depth, they very possible become the goals pursued by the future collider experiments.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my wife for her large helps. This research is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities Grant No. WK2030040054.

References

[1] G. Altarelli, M. W. Grunewald, Phys. Reps. 403-404, 189 (2004).

[2] R. N. Mohapatra, *et al.*, Rep. Prog. Phys. 70, 1757 (2007).

[3] G. Bertone, Particle Dark Matter (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[4] M. Dine and A. Kusenko, Rev. Mod. Phys. 76, 1 (2004).

[5] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, R. Slansky, in Supergravity, eds. P. van Niewenhuizen and D. Z. Freeman (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979); T. Yanagida, in Proc. of the Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Number in the Universe, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (Tsukuba, Japan, 1979); R. N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 912 (1980).

[6] M. Fukugita, T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B 174, 45 (1986); W. Buchmuller, R. D. Peccei and T. Yanagida, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 55, 311 (2005).

[7] D. E. Morrissey and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, New J. Phys. 14, 125003 (2012).

[8] A. Kusenko, Phys. Reps. 481, 1 (2009).

[9] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski, and K. Griest, Phys. Reps. 267, 195 (1996).

[10] David J.E. Marsh, Phys. Reps. 643, 1 (2016).

[11] H. Baer, Ki-Y. Choi, Jihn E. Kim, L. Roszkowski, Phys. Reps. 555, 1 (2015); J. Harz and Wei-Chi Huang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 30, 1530045 (2015); W. M. Yang, Phys. Lett. B 762, 138 (2016); W. M. Yang, Nucl. Phys. B 885, 505 (2014); W. M. Yang, Phys. Rev. D 87, 095003 (2013).

[12] G. B. Gelmini, arXiv:1502.01320.

[13] Planck Collab. 2015 Results XIII, Astron. & Astrophys., arXiv:1502.01589v2.

[14] A. D. Sakharov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 5, 32 (1967), JETP Lett. 5, 24 (1967), Sov. Phys.-Usp. 34, 392 (1991), Usp. Fiz. Nauk 161, 61 (1991).

[15] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, The Early universe, Front. Phys. 69, 1 (1990); D. S. Gorbunov and V. A. Rubakov, Introduction to The Theory of The Early Universe: Hot Big Bang Theory (World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd, 2011).

[16] V. A. Kuzmin, V. A. Rubakov, M. A. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B 155, 36 (1985).

[17] E. Komatsu *et al* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. 192, 18 (2011).

[18] C. Patrignani *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Chin. Phys. C, 40, 100001 (2016).

[19] CEPC-SPPC Study Group, CEPC-SPPC Preliminary Conceptual Design Report. 1. Physics and Detector, (2015).

[20] D. E. Morrissey, T. Plehn, T. M. P. Tait, Phys. Reps. 515, 1 (2012).